



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

rates of taxation; and debt and sinking funds. Each class of expenditures, except for waterworks (an important omission), is also further analyzed by years. The material in these tables might profitably have been used to show approximately the total expenditures for "governmental cost payments" and "outlays," as these terms are employed by the United States Census Bureau. Summary tables for selected four-year periods give average receipts and expenditures, except for interest, with percentage and, in the case of expenditures, per capita figures for each period. It would have been more useful, and involved no great increase of labor, to have given per capita and percentage figures for each year.

The chief omission which the reviewer has noticed is the failure to give a clear and comprehensive account of the finances of the waterworks, desirable both for itself and for its bearing on the interpretation of the general finances of the city. It would also have been useful to add a table showing in greater detail the elements such as land, buildings, bank stock, which have entered into the property assessment, and for which the reports of the assessors, in recent years at any rate, furnish the material.

There is an apparent discrepancy between the figures for receipts from sale of lands, page 380, and the figures for receipts from sale of property, page 369.

It is to be hoped that the number of studies such as this will increase rapidly. They furnish material which is absolutely essential to the financial history of the country as a whole.

Brown University.

HENRY B. GARDNER.

The New Protectionism. By J. A. HOBSON. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1916. Pp. xx, 153. \$1.00.)

The author directs his argument almost entirely against the suggested return of Great Britain to protection as outlined in the Paris Conference of June, 1916, and confines himself to testing the substance of the economic menace proposed and the validity of the measures suggested to meet it.

He is at his best when protesting that the compact, if adopted, would drive the Central Powers to enter into an economic alliance, toward which he denies that a single step has been taken; would render the trade relations of the Entente countries with neutrals more difficult; and drive into the arms of Germany the very trade the Entente is striving to secure and hold. Mr. Hobson's asser-

tion that the countries of the Entente cannot make themselves economically independent is refuted by Premier Lloyd George who said, on July 25, that Britain "intended to avoid its previous error and in the future would be able to support itself"; by Mr. Frederick C. Howe, who wrote in the *Century* for August, that "after the war is over England will endeavor to feed herself instead of being dependent upon America and Denmark"; and by Baron Rhondda, food controller of England, who declared on September 8 that "within a year the United Kingdom will be practically independent of imports so far as the chief food stuffs are concerned." If the United Kingdom should become able to feed herself, Russia would be compelled after the war, it would seem, to seek an outlet for her food products in Germany, whose economic annex she long has been.

In spite of the well established fact that behind nearly all German foreign trade has stood the German state and its militant policy of driving rivals out of business by a ruthless slashing of profits, the author regards German aggression "nothing but successful economic competition," and advances made by German trade and finance in all parts of the world "the results of private business enterprise."

Mr. Hobson revives the theory that "the general tendency of protection is to discourage energy, experiment and progress." This was written, it is true, before the United States entered the war; since which time we have been besought to save the allies with men, ships, aeroplanes, destroyers, and all supplies for the immense armies in the field. If the tariff under which the United States developed its industries had the effect Mr. Hobson says tariffs have, it is little short of marvelous that we are now assuming the laboring oar in nearly all branches of war activity. Certainly the ability with which Germany, a protectionist country, has fought the past three years, refutes the author's generalization.

Mr. Hobson claims too much by half for free trade, when he expresses the belief that "the good will shown to our cause by most neutral nations is to a large extent a half conscious acknowledgement of the superior liberality of our commercial policy." Does he ignore the violation of Belgian neutrality, the flagrant disregard for rights of neutral countries shown by Germany, and the instinctive admiration felt for the valiant fight made by France? And has he forgotten the almost universal lack of sympathy for

Great Britain during the Boer war, at which time "the superior liberality of our commercial policy" was the same as it is today?

Mr. Hobson further claims that free trade's contribution to the country's financial strength has enabled its citizens to bear the great economic burdens imposed by the war and to furnish the huge financial resources provided in the past two years, as well as to establish relations of credit in the United States and elsewhere resting ultimately upon our financial and commercial prestige. Yet as this review is being written it is admitted by the chairman of the British National War Savings Committee that the sales of securities which created those credits "are now practically at an end." The financial burden of the war has become too heavy and Great Britain has turned to the United States, a protectionist country, for help in the emergency. Instead of free-trade Britain being the banker for the enterprise at its most expensive stage, protectionist America assumes that onerous rôle, a circumstance which seems to require Mr. Hobson materially to reconstruct his claim.

Mr. Hobson refuses to admit what other eminent free-traders have conceded, that free trade has failed as a pacific agency. He not only refuses to admit any such thing but claims that while "British free trade could not keep the world at peace, it has helped to keep Britain at peace." Well may his reader ask, as he recalls the various wars in which Britain has taken part since 1846, Has it accomplished even that? Britain's war record since the repeal of the corn laws is not surpassed by that of any other country of considerable size or importance, save Russia, or perhaps Turkey. It was at war with Russia in 1854, with China and Persia in 1856, near war with the United States over Mason and Slidell in 1861, with the Ashantees in 1874; with Afghanistan in 1878; with the Zulus in 1879; engaged in the Egyptian campaign in 1884, and in the Boer war in 1899, not to mention the very critical dispute with the United States over the Venezuela boundary question. With that war record to her credit, it seems that the author claims a bit too much for the pacific influence of free trade upon British war propensities.

The reader who expects after a trenchant criticism of the Paris agreement to find suggested a constructive policy to take its place, will be disappointed to discover that all Mr. Hobson urges is economic internationalism as opposed to what he is pleased to call "the reactionary policy of nationalism." All he offers is

something not applicable to the belligerent countries—the most valuable markets anywhere to be found—but restricted to the so-called undeveloped and backward countries of the world. According to his plan equal admission and other trading facilities are to be accorded by all the Powers to foreign traders in all dependencies, colonies, protectorates, and spheres of influence.

But the most amazing portion of his program is the establishment of international commissions “to secure equality of treatment for the commerce, investments, and other property interests of the subjects of the treaty Powers in all backward or undeveloped countries not under the political control of any Power.” In these days when we are assured that the rights of small nations must be respected and the world is to be made safe for democracy, it is, indeed, anomalous to have it seriously proposed to deny to independent, though apparently at the moment backward, countries the right to make advantageous reciprocity treaties, a denial which is to be enforced by a league of strong, advanced nations against weak ones for the avowed purpose, forsooth, of depriving the powerful ones of the incentive to start wars. Strong nations are to be allowed the privilege of making special arrangements deemed advantageous, but weak economic ones are to be denied that privilege—which is a denial of justice, the pretended object of the program.

The author, undaunted by the failure of Cobden’s predictions to come true, presents with confidence unshaken this newer free trade (which he sees as the nucleus of a larger constructive internationalism) as the only possible security against future wars. Promises alone are presented at a time when experience has taught us afresh that no nation can maintain either independence or freedom when dependent upon the power of another.

The book gives many evidences of being a series of newspaper articles written at different times and with different purposes in view. It lacks coördination, containing many statements difficult, if not impossible, to harmonize. The program it presents expresses socialistic thought; but before it can be adopted, love of country must be swallowed up by admiration for internationalism.

JOHN BRUCE MCPHERSON.

The System of Financial Administration of Great Britain. A report by WILLIAM F. WILLOUGHBY, WESTEL W. WILLOUGHBY, and SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY. Introduction by